

REMARKS

Claims 1-79 are now pending in the application. Minor amendments have been made to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The amendments to the claims contained herein are not narrowing amendments. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roylance (U.S. Pat. No. 6,390,579) in view of Ng et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,011,679). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) (Section 2143.03) which specifically states "[t]o establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by prior art." Section 2143.03 of the MPEP further states that "all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In Re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496(CCPA1970). Applicant respectfully suggests that the Examiner has not met this requirement and further respectfully suggests that the art cited by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest independent claims 1, 15, 16, 31, 48, and 64.

With respect to independent claims 1, 16, 31, and 48, Applicant respectfully suggests that the art cited by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest a processor or means for generating a time-length signal comprising a first and second portion.

Roylance fails to teach or suggest a counting means for receiving said first portion of said time-length signal and counting indiscreet course steps to a predetermined number determined by said first portion of said time-length signal for providing a course adjusted signal. The Examiner has failed to point out an element which operates on a portion of the time-length signal generated by the processor.

Further, Roylance fails to teach or suggest a selection means coupled to said delay means for receiving said second portion of said time-length signal and for selecting a predetermined discreet delay period in said delay means, for creating discreet time steps. Applicant respectfully submits that because Roylance does not teach a processor for generating a time-length signal comprising a first and second portion, Roylance cannot teach or suggest this element. More particularly, Roylance does not teach or suggest the selection means as claimed. Nor has the Examiner provided any guidance as to how the Examiner has determined that Roylance does indeed teach or suggest the selection means. In particular, the Examiner has failed to show how Roylance teaches or suggests a selection means for receiving the second portion of the time-length signal and for selecting a predetermined discreet delay period and the delay means for creating discreet time steps.

Applicant respectfully submits the arguments made above apply equally with respect to claims 16, 31, and 48. Likewise, the arguments made above regarding deficiencies in the art cited by the Examiner apply equally to claims 15 and 64. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 15, 16, 31, 48, and 64 define over the art cited by the Examiner. Likewise, claims 2-14, 17-30, 32-47, 49-63, and 64-79 also define over the art cited by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 

By: 

Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/elh